

REMARKS

As an initial matter, Applicants note that the Examiner has not acknowledged Applicants' claim for foreign priority. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner acknowledge Applicants' claim for foreign priority in the next Office Action.

In the Office Action of August 26, 2004, the Examiner objected to the disclosure due to certain informalities. Applicants have made amendments to the specification which they believe satisfy the Examiner's concerns and overcome the objections.

In this regard, Applicants draw Examiner's attention to the amendment made to the paragraph beginning on page 2, line 19 and ending on page 3, line 5. In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that he did not understand the meaning of the term "atmos". The presence of this term resulted from an incorrect translation of the Japanese priority document. Applicants have replaced this term with the term "alarm", which is the correct translation.

In the Office Action, the Examiner also objected to the drawings. Applicants have corrected the drawings to overcome the Examiners' objections.

Claims 1-13 and 15-17 remain pending in the application. Claims 1-11 and 15-17 have been amended, and claim 14 has been canceled. Reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of the pending application in

view of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

The present invention relates to a broadcast system which includes a transmission device and a reception device. The transmission device of the present invention includes a multiplex portion for multiplexing main contents data and sub contents data, so as to generate a transport stream. The multiplex portion generates the sub contents data, including an output form ID that indicates an output form of the sub contents, and output contents data that indicate output contents. The reception device includes a reconstruction portion for controlling reconstruction of main contents and sub contents in according with a received transport stream. The reconstruction portion determines the output form of the sub contents data in accordance with an output form that is predetermined for the output form ID in the received sub contents data.

One embodiment of the present invention relates to a reconstruction program for controlling reconstruction of main contents and sub contents. The reconstruction program determines an output form of sub contents data in accordance with a predetermined output form for an output form ID in the sub contents data, and determines output contents of the sub contents data in accordance with output contents data in the sub contents data.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Beyers II et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,381,477). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following

reasons.

Beyers is directed to a subscription television system. Subscriber terminals in Beyers' subscription television system are provided with a transaction code or operand which provides a command or instruction for the terminals to follow. See col. 9, lines 30-32. In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that the transaction code instructs a microprocessor (410) to supply appropriate character codes and layout information to an on-screen display control (406). See col. 13, lines 51-54 of Beyers.

Beyers' layout information relates to an on-screen message alert. See col. 13, lines 49-50. Specifically, the layout information is recorded to an on-screen alert data field (see col. 12, lines 55-56 and Fig. 6B) which indicates settings as whether to overlay video images (see col. 13, lines 31-35), whether to activate a buzzer, and the activation period of the buzzer (see col. 13, lines 36-48).

Claim 13 of Applicants' present invention recites a reconstruction program that determines an output form of sub contents data in accordance with a predetermined output form for an output form ID in the sub contents data. In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that "the claimed program ability to determine an output form of sub contents data in accordance with a predetermined output form for an output form ID is met by the layouts stored in the ROM and accessed via the transaction code." Applicants respectfully disagree.

As discussed above, Beyers' transaction code sets multiple settings, such as whether to overlay video images, whether to activate a buzzer, and the activation period of the buzzer, for every message. However, Beyers' transaction code is set for each and every message, and there is no predetermined division of an output form ID and output contents data.

In contrast to Beyers, the output form ID of Applicants' present invention indicates the output form of sub contents. This facilitates changing the output form by changing the output form ID. For at least this reason, the output form ID as claimed in claim 13 does not correspond to Beyers' message definition transaction or transaction code. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Beyers does not anticipate claim 13, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In the Office Action, the Examiner also rejected claims 1-12 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Beyers in view of Eda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,760,820). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 1 and 15 of Applicants' present invention recites a broadcast system and method which includes a transmission device and a reception device. Claims 1 and 15 recite that the transmission device includes a multiplex portion for generating sub contents data, including an output form ID that indicates an output form of sub contents and output contents data that indicate output contents.

Claims 2 and 16 recite a transmission device and method including a multiplex portion for generating sub contents data, including an output form ID that indicates an output form of sub contents and output contents data that indicate output contents.

Claims 3 and 17 recite a reception device and method including a reconstruction portion for determining an output form of sub contents data in accordance with an output form that is predetermined for an output form ID in the received sub contents data, and for determining output contents of the sub contents data in accordance with output contents data in the received sub contents data.

Claim 12 recites contents data in which main contents data and sub contents data are multiplexed, and the sub contents data include an output form ID that indicates an output form of the sub contents and output contents data that indicate output contents.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that Beyers' message definition transaction and transaction code reads on Applicants' output form ID recited in claims 1-3, 12 and 15-17. For the reasons discussed above regarding claim 13, Applicants submit that their claimed output form ID does not correspond to Beyers' message definition transaction or transaction code. Applicants also submit that Eda fails to disclose this feature as well.

Eda relates to a contents multiplexing system, and was cited by the Examiner merely as teaching the multiplexing of main contents and sub



contents. Eda does not disclose the use of an output form ID. Therefore, even if Beyers and Eda could be combined, the proposed combination would not include each and every feature of Applicants' invention, as claimed in claims 1-3, 12 and 15-17. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection. Dependent claims 4-11 are also submitted to be in condition for allowance at least in view of their dependence on claim 1.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Entry and consideration of the present amendment, reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action, and allowance of the present application and all of the claims therein are respectfully requested and now believed to be appropriate. Applicant has made a sincere effort to place the present invention in condition for allowance and believes that he has now done so. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this response, or the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully Submitted,
Keisei YAMAMURO et al.


William Pleprz
Reg. No. 33,630

Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

February 28, 2005
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191